



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We are thus encouraged to hope that the two evils most to be dreaded from the war may be measurably prevented, that is, the militarization of the country and the adoption of what has been called "imperialism." The danger in both these directions is, however, great, and it will take the combined and immediate efforts of all those who wish to see the national character remain as in the past, to prevent the country from going much further astray than it has already done. The swift victories of the navy have awakened the old passion of military glory, and the enlargement of both army and navy consequent upon the war will make it most difficult to keep either within the limits heretofore maintained or any other reasonable limits. There will be a determined effort to bring about generally much greater preparation for war, after the European models. The tendency of all this is plain to see, and neither voice nor pen should be spared to try to counteract it. The masses of the people who are not much accustomed to make themselves heard on public questions, though they constitute the real life and worth of the nation, have it within their power to save the country at the present time, if they will only arouse themselves to do their duty.

The danger in the directions indicated is greatly increased by the annexation proposed of considerable of the territory wrested from Spain by the war. Even if the Philippines should be entirely left out, the danger will only be lessened. Porto Rico and the other Spanish West India islands, if annexed, will have to be governed for a time at least by military occupation. This means a larger army and more warships. Hawaii has already been annexed, and one of the first things done was to send thither a warship and a regiment of soldiers. It is announced that the building of three new battleships will be recommended to Congress when it meets next winter. Thus territorial expansion and military and naval development will go hand in hand. To what extent the militarization shall go, will depend upon the faithfulness of the people in holding the government authorities to the fundamental national ideals, on which our real glory and influence have so far rested. The growth of the navy and army will incline to go much beyond the territorial expansion resulting from the war. The party advocating this will be alert and active, and will have to be met at Washington with a ceaseless inflow of opposing influence.

Not only in meeting directly these dangerous tendencies will the friends of peace have an imperative duty to perform. They must push their cause on its positive side without delay. Every mail that goes into Washington ought to carry letters urging the immediate revival of the Anglo-American arbitration treaty. The time is highly favorable for this, and the opportune moment must not be allowed to pass by unimproved. Then, all other lines of work for arbitration and peace must be followed up with increased earnestness. There is a large amount of public opinion favorable in a general way to peace but not yet rid of false notions about war. This must be won over to the right side. The friends of peace never had larger opportunities or larger responsibilities than at the present critical moment in our national life. The forces of evil abound; the forces of good must much more abound.

Battleships and Universities.

At the Alumni dinner at Harvard University, on the 29th of June, some remarks were made by President Eliot, in reference to the war with Spain, which surprised a good many persons present and a still larger number who read them in the papers. These remarks seemed so out of harmony with the teachings of the President of Harvard just before the war, and particularly in his address at the Washington Arbitration Conference of April, 1896.

"The educated youth, who loves his country, does not stop to consider in what precise cause his country has gone to war. If he did, he could not find out."

If this sentence, which constituted the basis of one section of the speech, means anything, it means that true patriotism is blind and unreasoning, and asks no questions, when the government authorities decide upon a war, either as to its cause or what its results are likely to be. No doctrine could be more pernicious than this. It is exactly the same sentiment as that of Emperor William when he talks about "iron blind obedience." "My country, right or wrong," in its worst possible interpretation, is not a mite worse. One would think that an educated youth, of all others, would be just the one to know, and that he would be advised by the President of Harvard University to know, why his country goes to war; and that he would be the last youth in the nation to fling himself blindly down at his country's feet, right or wrong, "just as a lover throws a rose at the feet of his mistress." That, unfortunately, is the sort of patriotism which has always prevailed in the world, and it is the chief support of the cruel and irrational militarism of the present day.

But a more astonishing remark still was the one in which Dr. Eliot said that he considered vicious the whole argument of Charles Sumner that the enormous sums of money put into *war preparations in time of peace* ought rather to be expended in education, in the administration of justice, in charity, in lessening the burdens of the over-taxed masses, and in other constructive ways.

Charles Francis Adams, president of the Alumni, in introducing President Eliot, had said, in depreciation of the war with Spain, that the cost of the war, estimated at forty million dollars per month, would run three hundred and sixty-five universities the size of Harvard. Referring to this statement, Dr. Eliot said :

"I am not sure I shall be able to follow President Adams in the line he has suggested. The quick capital of Harvard University is not more than the cost of two battleships, but can we compute what those battleships may win? It was Charles Sumner, who looks down upon us from the other side of this hall, who first made comparisons of that nature, and some years after he had made them, there came upon us the terrific struggle which President Adams has been describing so eloquently. About that time I came to the conclusion that the whole argument of Charles Sumner was a vicious one."

We have not space to give the text of Sumner's argument. It is found in section iv, 6, of his oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations," occupying fourteen or more pages of that famous speech. Whoever will take the trouble to examine it, will see that Sumner's whole argument was directed, not against war in any and every case, nor against any and every warship, but against the folly and wickedness of the enormous outlays by the nations in "*preparations for war in time of peace*," and their equally culpable penuriousness, in comparison, in providing for education, the administration of justice, for charity, in a word, "for the surpassing interests of knowledge and benevolence." His comparison of the cost of construction and maintenance of the battleship Ohio, then "swinging idly" in Boston harbor, with that of Harvard College was only a single illustration in his argument, which was directed against "armed peace," and covered the whole range of the vast burdens of war preparations throughout what is called Christendom.

President Eliot must certainly have lost from mind Mr. Sumner's meaning, or he never would have said that he considered the whole argument a vicious one. It is the same argument which he himself, along with other distinguished university and college presidents, has been urging with great force against a system which is more and more absorbing the revenues of all the nations and driving them straight on to ultimate exhaustion and ruin.

Or did the President of Harvard really mean to say what his speech, fairly interpreted, made him say : That the fact that a war is to cost forty millions a month, with all that that means of increased taxation, derangement of business and withdrawal of resources from nearly every line of civil enterprise, is to be taken little account of in deciding whether the nation is to enter upon war? That the reckless haste with which national legislators are ready to rush into war involving prodigious sums, not a tithe of which they would ever dream of voting for any other purpose, exhibits a healthful public spirit? Does he mean that two warships, because of what they may possibly win in some remote contingency, are, as *standing institutions*, worth more to the nation than a great university like Harvard doing its noble work steadily year after year? And does he mean to excuse the nations for putting such huge sums into war vessels and other like things, because of what they may possibly win, though it be at the expense of their schools, their shops, their farms and their kitchens? Does he wish our country to proceed further on a course like that. When he says that for more than thirty years he has held Sumner's whole argument to be a vicious one, does he wish to be understood as approving the system of modern militarism which keeps five million soldiers under arms and nearly a thousand war-dogs on the sea; which, since he became convinced of the viciousness of Sumner's argument, has doubled the war debts of the world, until they now reach the staggering sum of thirty thousand millions; which yearly sinks, in direct expenses and interest, two thousand millions more, and has reduced some of the populations of Europe to actual starvation?

President Eliot's Alumni dinner speech, if it is to be taken seriously and if it is assumed that he knew what Sumner's argument was, commits him to the present system of "bloated armaments," which Mr. Gladstone so much deplored in his closing days; and the most passionate advocates of a large increase of our own navy and army may well quote the President of Harvard University, as the New York *Sun* has already done, as in perfect sympathy with their un-American schemes.

We do not believe, however, that this apparently deliberate rejection of Sumner's great argument, any more than the extraordinary notion of educated patriotism advanced by him, both of which were so vociferously cheered by Harvard's "educated" and "patriotic" sons, represents in any just sense the position of Harvard's president. We appeal from President Eliot, the Alumni dinner orator in time of the excitement and delirium of war, to President Eliot in time of peace and sobriety. In his address at the Washington Conference in 1896, he spoke of the recent jingoism in this country as "a detestable thing," "an offensive foreign importa-

tion," "the most abject copy conceivable of a pernicious foreign idea," "a delusion than which a more complete can not be imagined." "What other powerful nation has dispensed with a standing army? What other nation with an immense seaboard has maintained but an insignificant fleet? It has been our glory to be safe, though without fortresses, fleets or armies."

We believe Sumner would have called these sentences a most consummate practical statement of his argument, and that he would have recognized his own voice in the following magnificent passage from the same speech of President Eliot:

"Now, Gentlemen, I, too, believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission; but it is not that one (of armed force). It is not by force of arms that we may best commend to the peoples of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government; but rather by taking millions from various peoples into our own land, and here giving them experience of the advantages of freedom. . . . There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example—by giving persuasive example of happiness and prosperity, arrived at through living in freedom and at peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or land. Never should we attempt to force another nation to adopt arbitration or *any other doctrine of peace.*"

The Czar's Note.

The note, given in full on page 191, which the Czar of Russia, on the 24th of August, through his foreign minister, handed to the representatives at St. Petersburg of the European powers, calling for a conference in the interests of a reduction of armaments and of peace, will, if it proves to be meant seriously, stand as one of the most important state documents issued during this century. The note was unexpected, and has produced a profound impression in Europe. Various motives have been assigned for the issuing of the call for a conference at the present time, but the note itself bears evidence that the motives there given are the real ones which determined the Czar's course. His reasons for desiring a reduction of armaments are the same as those put forth by the friends of peace for many years, namely, that the constant increase of armaments tends to insecurity instead of peace, that they are a crushing load on the people and that they prevent the development of those interests on which human welfare everywhere depends.

The note has met with a favorable reception nearly everywhere in Europe, though of course there have been cynical slurs and imputation of bad motives. The difficulties in the way of such a conference are pointed out particularly in France, but the purpose

of Emperor Nicholas is in general highly praised. It is thought that the governments of other European nations knew of the Czar's intention, and that therefore the conference is sure to meet. The large approval given by the European press will make it much easier to secure the consent of the governments to the holding of the conference. It is recognized in all intelligent quarters in Europe that the mad rivalry in armaments must before long cease, either through the awful cataclysm which the Czar points out or through some peaceful agreement of the powers. The hour has come for the beginning of disarmament. The authoritative voice in its behalf has been heard none too soon. One trembles to think what may happen in Europe in the near future if the Czar's purpose should fail of realization. The conference, it seems to us, will be held because it must be held, if ruin, widespread and fearful, is to be averted.

All good men everywhere will watch with the greatest interest the developments which the Czar's move brings about. It may be, we can not help believing that it is, the beginning of one of the grandest and most beneficent movements which history has ever recorded.

Editorial Notes.

On Tuesday, July 26th, the French ambassador, M. Jules Cambon, presented to President McKinley a message from the Spanish government looking to the end of the war. On Saturday following the President, after much consultation with his cabinet and a further conference with M. Cambon, communicated his reply to the Spanish overtures, stating the terms of peace acceptable to the United States. On August 6th, the Spanish Cabinet formulated its reply to the President's terms, which were virtually accepted. After approval by the Queen Regent the reply was sent by way of Paris to Washington, where it was received on the 8th and communicated to the President on the 9th. On the 10th, the peace protocol prepared by Secretary Day was approved by the French Ambassador and forwarded to Madrid. On the 11th the Spanish Cabinet instructed Ambassador Cambon to sign the protocol, and the President cabled to the generals of the army and navy to suspend all hostilities. On the 12th at twenty-three minutes past 4 o'clock the protocol was signed by Ambassador Cambon and Secretary Day, and the war was virtually ended. The ceremony of signing the protocol in the cabinet room at the White House, with President McKinley sitting at the head of the table, was simple but impressive. Out of courtesy the copy intended for Spain was signed first. After the signatures were affixed all present joined in congratulations over the beneficent attainment. Final word was then sent to the army and the navy that hostilities should cease.